



PROPOSAL EVALUATION

IRWM Grant Program – Local Groundwater Assistance, FY 2012-2013

Applicant	City of Santa Rosa	County	Sonoma
Project Title	Monitoring Well Installation and Data Analysis	Grant Request	\$ 250,000.00
		Total Project Cost	\$ 323,862.50

Project Description: The proposed project installs 3 additional groundwater monitoring well sets to identify water level and water quality data in areas where data gaps have been identified.

Evaluation Summary:

Scoring Criterion	Score
GWMP or Program	3
Technical Adequacy of Work to be Performed	4
Work Plan	6
Budget	3
Schedule	3
QA/QC	3
Past Performance	3
Geographical Balance	0
Total Score	25

- **GWMP or Program:** The criterion is less than fully addressed and documentation or rationales are incomplete or insufficient. The application notes that a current scope of work is underway by the applicant to develop and adopt a GWMP for the Santa Rosa Plain. A project schedule attached to the GWMP work agreement and other submitted information indicated the GWMP will be completed and adopted in January 2014.
- **Technical Adequacy of Work to be Performed:** The criterion is fully addressed but not fully supported by well-presented documentation and logical rationale. For example, the project primarily proposes to install groundwater monitoring wells to fill data gaps on groundwater conditions in the basin. In support of this objective and goal, the project description includes support for this goal by stating that 1) an initial draft of a Salt and Nutrient Management Plan for the Santa Rosa Plain sub-basin has identified the need for up to an additional 5 monitoring wells in areas where there are data gaps, and 2) a CASGEM work plan identified potential data gaps in the eastern central portions of the sub-basin that could be diminished with the installation of additional monitoring wells. In addition, the description notes that a lack of site specific data is hampering the City's establishment of baseline conditions needed to identify positive impacts and mitigate adverse impacts from various water resource management plans under consideration. The project description goes on to present a rationale for the number and depth of wells being considered for the project. However with regard to criterion #3, no map is presented of the current monitoring well locations in relationship to the new areas proposed to be monitored. In addition, the referenced CASGEM work plan was not provided in the application.
- **Work Plan:** The criterion is less than fully addressed and documentation or rationales are incomplete or insufficient. With respect to criterion #5, there is no mention of how the information gained from the project will be disseminated. With respect to criterion #1, a criteria is proposed to evaluate and rank each of the proposed monitoring well sites; however, the description does not define what constitutes the "most critical data gap locations (second bullet of Task 1)," or who's interest or what well sites' technical merits will come first in the Team's weighted scoring factors. Sound logic is not presented for placing gravel pack material in the bottom 250 feet of the borehole (i.e., 250 to 500 feet bgs as stated on page 5, second paragraph, sixth sentence of the project description) when the objective is to discretely monitor the intermediate depth zone at 230 to 250 feet bgs.
- **Budget:** The criterion is less than fully addressed and documentation or rationales are incomplete or insufficient. For example, the budget is consistent with the work plan and schedule, and includes the sources of funding. However, the budget information does not include detailed breakdown of costs (e.g., labor hours and rates, engineer's estimate with cost basis, lab costs, driller's quotes, etc.). In the absence of a stated basis for preparing technical specifications for test drilling and well installation, the total cost estimate for Task 2 appears excessive. Sound reasoning for using 4-inch-diameter well casing is not provided. Many nested monitoring wells are constructed to similar depths (e.g., up to 300 feet bgs) using 2-inch or 3-inch diameter casing at considerable cost savings. More description of the City's competitive bidding process is needed.



PROPOSAL EVALUATION

IRWM Grant Program – Local Groundwater Assistance, FY 2012-2013

- **Schedule:** The criterion is less than fully addressed and documentation or rationales are incomplete or insufficient. The schedule provides adequate detail with task durations and key milestones identified. However, a sound rationale is not presented for taking four months to evaluate the site-specific hydrologic data when the budget for this task is only \$15,000. It is unclear why the field construction task would begin in the middle of the wet season (e.g., early February).
- **QA/QC:** The criterion is less than fully addressed and documentation or rationales are incomplete or insufficient. For example, the information provided makes weak reference to professional titles without being specific about roles and responsibilities for these “professionals”. In particular, the information does not indicate the applicant is committed to the work being performed under the responsible charge of a California-licensed Professional Geologist or Engineer when the work primarily involves monitoring well installation.
- **Past Performance:** The criterion is less than fully addressed and documentation or rationales are incomplete or insufficient. The applicant presents positive statements on the relative success of meeting the project budget and schedule for an ongoing a \$3.9 million Proposition 50 Implementation Grant – the Sonoma County Water Recycling and Habitat Preservation Program – Phase 2a.